

<b>TO: Mail Stop 8</b> <b>Director of the U.S. Patent &amp; Trademark Office</b> <b>P.O. Box 1450</b> <b>Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</b>	<b>REPORT ON THE</b> <b>FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN</b> <b>ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR</b> <b>TRADEMARK</b>
---	---

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been  
filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following ☒ Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO. <b>CV 08-00882 JL</b>	DATE FILED <b>2/8/08</b>	U.S. DISTRICT COURT <b>Northern District of California, San Francisco Division</b>
PLAINTIFF <b>HTC CORPORATION, ET AL.</b>		DEFENDANT <b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, ET AL.</b>
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1 <b>5,809,336</b>		
2 <b>5,784,584</b>		
3 <b>5,440,749</b>		
4 <b>6,598,148</b>		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment <input type="checkbox"/> Answer <input type="checkbox"/> Cross Bill <input type="checkbox"/> Other Pleading	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT
--------------------

CLERK  Richard W. Wieking	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK  Gloria Acevedo	DATE  February 13, 2008
---------------------------------	---	-------------------------------

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner    Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner  
Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner    Copy 4—Case file copy

1 WILLIAM SLOAN COATS (SBN 98464)  
2 MARK R. WEINSTEIN (SBN 193043)  
3 SAM O'ROURKE (SBN 205233)  
4 KYLE D. CHEN (SBN 239501)  
5 **WHITE & CASE LLP**  
6 3000 El Camino Real  
7 Five Palo Alto Square, 9th Floor  
8 Palo Alto, California 94306  
9 Telephone: (650) 213-0300  
10 Facsimile: (650) 213-8158

**E-FILING**

**ADR**

**ORIGINAL FILED**

**FEB 8 2008**

**Richard W. Wieking  
Clerk, U.S. District Court  
Northern District of California  
San Jose**

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
12 HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 HTC CORPORATION and  
16 HTC AMERICA, INC.,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED,  
20 PATRIOT SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION  
21 and ALLIACENSE LIMITED,

22 Alliacense.

**[REDACTED]**

**CASE NO:**

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT**

**JL**

**C08 00882**

1 Plaintiffs HTC Corporation ("HTC") and HTC America, Inc. ("HTC America")  
2 (collectively "Plaintiffs"), by and through their attorneys, allege as follows:

3 1. This is a civil action arising under the Patent Laws of the United States, 35  
4 U.S.C. §§101, et seq., seeking a declaratory judgment that no valid and enforceable claim of  
5 United States Patent Numbers 5,809,336 ("336 patent"); 5,784,584 ("584 patent"); 5,440,749  
6 ("749 patent"); and 6,598,148 ("148 patent") (collectively the "patents-in-suit") are infringed by  
7 Plaintiffs.

### 8 PARTIES

9 2. Plaintiff HTC is a Taiwan corporation with its principal place of business  
10 in Taoyuan, Taiwan, R.O.C.

11 3. Plaintiff HTC America is a Texas corporation with its principal place of  
12 business in Bellevue, Washington.

13 4. Defendant Technology Properties Ltd. ("TPL") is, on information and  
14 belief, a California corporation with its principal place of business in Cupertino, California. On  
15 information and belief, TPL is a co-owner of the patents-in-suit.

16 5. Defendant Patriot Scientific Corporation ("Patriot") is, on information and  
17 belief, incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware and maintains its principal place of  
18 business in Carlsbad, California. On information and belief, Patriot is a co-owner of the patents-  
19 in-suit.

20 6. Defendant Alliacense Ltd. ("Alliacense") is, on information and belief, a  
21 California corporation with its principal place of business in Cupertino, California. On  
22 information and belief, Alliacense is responsible for negotiating possible licenses to the patents-  
23 in-suit with third parties, on behalf of TPL.

### 24 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

25 7. The Plaintiffs file this complaint against TPL, Patriot and Alliacense  
26 (collectively "Defendants") pursuant to the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the  
27 United States Code, with a specific remedy sought based upon the laws authorizing actions for  
28 declaratory judgment in the federal courts of the United States, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

1           8.     This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action, which arises  
2 under the patent laws of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), and 2201.

3           9.     Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and (c) and  
4 1400(b) because, on information and belief, Defendants are corporations subject to personal  
5 jurisdiction in this District and, on information and belief, TPL and Alliacense maintain their  
6 principal places of business in this District.

7                           **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

8           10.    This action is properly filed in the San Jose Division of the Northern  
9 District of California because Defendants reside, or do business, in this district.

10                          **EXISTENCE OF AN ACTUAL CONTROVERSY**

11           11.    There is an actual controversy within the jurisdiction of this Court under 28  
12 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

13           12.    Beginning in or about December 2005 and continuing thereafter,  
14 Alliacense has demanded that Plaintiffs enter into a royalty-bearing license for the patents-in-suit.  
15 Alliacense has taken the position that certain products of Plaintiffs are “covered” by one or more  
16 claims of the patents-in-suit. Alliacense further told Plaintiffs that if they did not take a license to  
17 the patents-in-suit, Plaintiffs might be subject to substantial liabilities. Alliacense also provided  
18 claim charts purporting to describe how more than ten products of Plaintiffs allegedly infringe  
19 one or more claims of the patents-in-suit.

20           13.    Alliacense and HTC met multiple times throughout 2006 and 2007 to  
21 discuss a possible license, with the most recent meeting having taken place at HTC’s headquarters  
22 in Taoyuan, Taiwan on November 8, 2007. Throughout this period, Alliacense continued to  
23 demand that Plaintiffs take a license to the patents-in-suit. For example, on October 9, 2007,  
24 Alliacense sent HTC a memorandum advising that “if HTC wishes to postpone its licensing,”  
25 then “HTC’s products are exposed to litigation and ITC actions.” Plaintiffs and Alliacense  
26 continued to discuss a possible license during the following months, but the parties were unable  
27 to reach an agreement.  
28

1           14.     Based upon the above facts, there is an actual and justiciable controversy  
2 within the jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

3                           **FIRST CLAIM**

4                   **DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS REGARDING THE '336 PATENT**

5           15.     The Plaintiffs hereby restate and reallege the allegations set forth in  
6 paragraphs 1 through 13 and incorporate them by reference.

7           16.     No valid and enforceable claim of the '336 patent is infringed by the  
8 Plaintiffs.

9                           **SECOND CLAIM**

10           **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING THE '584 PATENT**

11          17.     The Plaintiffs hereby restate and reallege the allegations set forth in  
12 paragraphs 1 through 13 and incorporate them by reference.

13          18.     No valid and enforceable claim of the '584 patent is infringed by the  
14 Plaintiffs.

15                           **THIRD CLAIM**

16           **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING THE '749 PATENT**

17          19.     The Plaintiffs hereby restate and reallege the allegations set forth in  
18 paragraphs 1 through 13 and incorporate them by reference.

19          20.     No valid and enforceable claim of the '749 patent is infringed by the  
20 Plaintiffs.

21                           **FOURTH CLAIM**

22           **DECLARATORY JUDGMENT REGARDING THE '148 PATENT**

23          21.     The Plaintiffs hereby restate and reallege the allegations set forth in  
24 paragraphs 1 through 13 and incorporate them by reference.

25          22.     No valid and enforceable claim of the '148 patent is infringed by the  
26 Plaintiffs.

27        ///


**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

1. Declaring that no valid and enforceable claim of the patents-in-suit is infringed by the Plaintiffs;
2. Declaring that Alliacense and each of their officers, employees, agents, alter egos, attorneys, and any persons in active concert or participation with them be restrained and enjoined from further prosecuting or instituting any action against the Plaintiffs claiming that the patents-in-suit are valid, enforceable, or infringed, or from representing that the products or services of the Plaintiffs infringe the patents-in-suit;
3. A judgment declaring this case exceptional under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and awarding the Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this case;
4. Awarding the Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 8, 2008

WILLIAM SLOAN COATS  
MARK R. WEINSTEIN  
SAM O'ROURKE  
KYLE D. CHEN  
WHITE & CASE LLP

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle D. Chen  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
HTC Corporation and HTC America, Inc.